

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-9, 18-38, 47-68 and 77-93 were pending. In this amendment, claims 2-4, 6-9, 18, 20-29, 31-33, 35-38, 47, 49-58, 61-68, 77, and 79-92 are amended. Claims 1, 30, 59, and 60 are canceled and no claims are added. No new matter is added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, claims 1-9, 18-38, 47-58, 61-68, and 77-93 pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a), Gilboy, Laursen, Jones

Claims 1-9, 20-38, 49-68, and 79-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilboy (U.S. Patent 6,829,233 81) in view of Laursen (U.S. Patent 6,895,23481).

Claim 22

Claim 22 is allowable over these cited references, either alone or in combination, as those references fail to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 22. For example, claim 22 recites:

*said short-name comprising a root number corresponding to the website ...
wherein said short-name further comprises a non-numerical separator character and an extension number, said separator character separating said root number from said extension number.*

Gilboy is directed to providing targeted advertising to a caller using Internet telephony. *See Gilboy*, col. 1 lines 21-34. An Internet telephony service provider (ITSP) 18 is linked to a calling party number (CPN) database 20. *Id.*, col. 2 lines 51-57. The ITSP 18 determines what targeted information to send to the calling party based on the phone number of the calling party or the dialed number. *Id.*, co. 3 lines 12-19 and col. 5 lines 4-7. The CPN database 20 or dialed number (DN) database 22 has an entry for each subscriber indexed by the calling party's phone number 202 or the dialed number 302. *Id.*, FIG. 3 and col. 4 lines 7-10. One or more websites (content 304) are associated with a particular subscriber's phone number 302. *Id.*, col. 4 lines 10-11.

At page 7, the Office Action asserts that the phone number 302 teaches a separator character and an extension number. However, at page 3, the Office Action asserts that

the phone number 302 is the claimed root number. As the separator character and extension number are separately claimed elements, the phone number 302 as a whole cannot correspond to all three claim elements.

Additionally, different parts of the phone number 302 do not correspond to these claim elements. For example, it is the whole phone number 302 that is associated with the content 204 (i.e. the website), not just part of the phone number 302. Thus, the whole phone number 302 would need to correspond to the claimed root number, which “*correspond[s] to the website,*” as recited in claim 22.

Accordingly, Gilboy does not teach or suggest a short-name further comprising “*a non-numerical separator character and an extension number,*” as recited in claim 22.

Furthermore, Lauren uses bookmarks to provide shortcut links to a website, not received numbers, such as the claimed root number or extension number. *See Laursen*, FIG. 9 and col. 13 lines 17-67.

Accordingly, these reference alone, or in combination, do not teach or suggest “*wherein said short-name further comprises a non-numerical separator character and an extension number.*”

For at least these reasons, claim 22 and its dependent claims are allowable over these references.

Claim 27

Claim 27 is allowable over these cited references, either alone or in combination, as those references fail to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 27. For example, claim 27 recites:

said short-name comprising a root number corresponding to the website
...
wherein said short-name comprises in order, a country code indicator sequence, a country code, a separator character, and the root number.

As described above, Gilboy does not teach or suggest using additional numbers or characters to access a particular internet address, besides the phone number 302. And, Laursen uses shortcut links, not received numbers.

Accordingly, these reference alone, or in combination, do not teach or suggest the short-name comprising “*in order, a country code indicator sequence, a country code, a separator character, and the root number,*” as recited in claim 27.

For at least these reasons, claim 27 is allowable over these references.

Claims 51, 81

Applicants submit that independent claims 51 and 81 and their respective dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22.

Claims 58, 88

Applicants submit that independent claims 56 and 86 and their respective dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 27.

Claim 90

Claim 90 is allowable over these cited references, either alone or in combination, as those references fail to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 90. For example, claim 90 recites “*prior to receiving the root number, receiving a non-numerical start character from the wireless device, wherein the start character signifies that the root number is to follow.*”

As described above, Gilboy does not teach or suggest using receiving any characters before receiving the phone number 302. And, Laursen uses shortcut links, not received numbers or a characters.

Accordingly, these reference alone, or in combination, do not teach or suggest the short-name comprising “*receiving a non-numerical start character,*” prior to receiving the root number, as recited in claim 90.

For at least these reasons, claim 90 and its dependent claims are allowable over these references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/David B. Raczkowski/

David B. Raczkowski
Reg. No. 52,145

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
DBR:scz
61596432 v1